IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA CHARLOTTE DIVISION

SUSAN ARENDS,)
Plaintiff,)) No. 3:10-cy-558
VS.)
PINNACLE FINANCIAL GROUP, INCORPORATED,)))) JURY DEMAND ENDORSED HEREON
Defendant.)

COMPLAINT

NOW COMES the Plaintiff, SUSAN ARENDS, by and through her attorney, M. LYNETTE HARTSELL, and for her Complaint against the Defendant, PINNACLE FINANCIAL GROUP, INCORPORATED, Plaintiff alleges and states as follows:

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. This is an action for actual and statutory damages for violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (hereinafter the "FDCPA"), 15 U.S.C. § 1692, *et seq.*, and the North Carolina Prohibited Practices by Collection Agencies Engaged in the Collection of Debts from Consumers Statute, N.C. Gen. Stat. § 58-70-90, *et seq.*

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

2. Jurisdiction arises under the FDCPA, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq. Venue lies properly in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), as a substantial part of the events and omissions giving rise to the claim occurred within this District.

PARTIES

- 3. Plaintiff is an individual who was at all relevant times residing in Charlotte, North Carolina.
- 4. Plaintiff is a "consumer" as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3) and N.C. Gen. Stat. § 58-70-90(2), as she is a natural person allegedly obligated to pay a debt.
- 5. At all relevant times, Defendant acted as a "debt collector" within the meaning of 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6) and as a "collection agency" within the meaning of N.C. Gen. Stat. § 58-70-90(1), in that it held itself out to be a company collecting a consumer debt allegedly owed by Plaintiff.
- 6. On information and belief, Defendant is a corporation of the State of Minnesota, which is licensed to do business in North Carolina and which has its principal place of business in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

COUNT I

(Violation of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act)

- 7. On or about May 9, 2010, Defendant's representatives and/or employees, including but not limited to individuals who represented themselves as Jackson Taylor (hereinafter "Taylor"), Linda Smith (hereinafter "Smith"), and Dan (last name unknown), began contacting Plaintiff by telephone in attempts to collect the aforementioned alleged debt.
- 8. During a telephone conversation with Plaintiff on or about May 12, 2010, Taylor represented and/or implied that he was an attorney and/or communicating on behalf of an attorney when he threatened to garnish Plaintiff's wages, place a lien on Plaintiff's house, freeze Plaintiff's assets and initiate legal action against Plaintiff if she did not make payment of the alleged debt.

- 9. To the best of Plaintiff's knowledge, no legal action has been initiated against her with regard to the alleged debt.
- 10. On or about May 19, 2010, Smith contacted Plaintiff's mother by telephone in an attempt to collect the alleged debt, despite already having successfully made contact with Plaintiff.
- During said telephone conversation, Smith disclosed to Plaintiff's mother that 11. Plaintiff owed an alleged debt, and further disclosed the Defendant's company name.
- 12. On or about June 11, 2010, Smith again contacted Plaintiff's mother and father inlaw by telephone in an attempt to collect the alleged debt, despite already having successfully made contact with Plaintiff.
- In its attempts to collect the aforementioned alleged debt, Defendant violated the 13. FDCPA in one or more of the following ways:
 - Identifying the name of Defendant's company while communicating with a. a person other than Plaintiff without having been expressly requested to do so, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692b(1);
 - Communicating with a person other than Plaintiff and stating to such b. person that Plaintiff owes an alleged debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692b(2);
 - Communicating with someone other than Plaintiff in connection with the c. collection of the alleged debt without a proper purpose, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(b);

- d. Falsely representing or implying that Defendant's employee was an attorney or was communicating on behalf of an attorney, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(3);
- Representing or implying that nonpayment of the alleged debt would e. result in the seizure, garnishment, attachment and/or sale of Plaintiff's property or wages where such action was unlawful and/or Defendant did not intend to take such action, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(4);
- f. Threatening to take action that could not legally be taken and/or that was not intended to be taken, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(5); and
- By acting in an otherwise deceptive, unfair and unconscionable manner g. and failing to comply with the FDCPA.
- 14. As a result of Defendant's violations as aforesaid, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer personal humiliation, embarrassment, mental anguish and emotional distress.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, SUSAN ARENDS, respectfully prays for a judgment against Defendant as follows:

- Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for each violation of the FDCPA; a.
- All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation b. costs incurred by Plaintiff; and
- Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court. c.

COUNT II

(Violation of the North Carolina Prohibited Practices by Collection Agencies

Engaged in the Collection of Debts from Consumers Statute)

- 15. Plaintiff hereby adopts, re-alleges and incorporates by reference all allegations set forth above as though fully rewritten here.
- In its attempts to collect the aforementioned alleged debt, Defendant violated the 16. North Carolina Prohibited Practices by Collection Agencies Engaged in the Collection of Debts from Consumers Statute in one or more of the following ways:
 - Communicating with a person other than Plaintiff and stating to such a. person that Plaintiff owes an alleged debt, in violation of N.C. Gen. Stat. § 58-70-105(1);
 - Communicating with someone other than Plaintiff in connection with the b. collection of the alleged debt without a proper purpose, in violation of N.C. Gen. Stat. § 58-70-105(1);
 - Falsely representing or implying that Defendant's employee was an c. attorney or was communicating on behalf of an attorney, in violation of N.C. Gen. Stat. § 58-7-110(7);
 - d. Representing or implying that nonpayment of the alleged debt would result in the seizure, garnishment, attachment and/or sale of Plaintiff's property or wages where such action was unlawful and/or Defendant did not intend to take such action, in violation of N.C. Gen. Stat. § 58-70-95(5) and (6);

- e. Threatening to take action that could not legally be taken and/or that was not intended to be taken, in violation of N.C. Gen. Stat. § 58-70-95(7) and (8); and
- f. By acting in an otherwise deceptive, unfair and unconscionable manner and failing to comply with North Carolina law.
- 17. As a result of Defendant's violations as aforesaid, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer personal humiliation, embarrassment, mental anguish and emotional distress.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, SUSAN ARENDS, respectfully prays for a judgment against Defendant as follows:

- a. Statutory damages of \$4,000.00 for each violation of the North Carolina
 Prohibited Practices by Collection Agencies Engaged in the Collection of
 Debts from Consumers Statute;
- b. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiff; and
- c. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

JURY DEMAND

Pursuant to Civil Rule 38, Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues in this action, except for any issues relating to the amount of attorneys' fees and litigation costs to be awarded should Plaintiff prevail on any of her claims in this action.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ M. Lynette Hartsell M. Lynette Hartsell (9845) Attorney for Plaintiff 1010 Lakeview Drive Cedar Grove, NC 27231 (888) 493-0770, ext. 305 (866) 551-7791 fax Lynette@LuxenburgLevin.com